

## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	AT	ORNEY DOCKET NO
08/467,700 06/06/95	CHASE	<del></del>	III26A-US
		EXÃ	WINER
	31M1/0403	STORMER, R	
REMY J VANOPHEM	314170403	TINU TRA	PAPER NUMBER
755 W BIG BEAVER ROAD			5
SUITE 1313 TROY MI 48084-4903		3102	
		DATE MAILED:	
his is a communication from the examiner in char COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMAR	ge of your application. RKS		04/03/96
		۸	
This application has been examined	Responsive to communication filed on 2	9 LEC 95 X	This action is made
shortened statutory period for response to this ac	tion is set to expire (3 month/e)	, days from the	n data of this latter
allure to respond within the period for response wi	ili cause the application to become abando	oned. 35 U.S.C. 133	e date of this letter.
art I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARI	E PART OF THIS ACTION:		
1. Notice of References Cited by Examine		tice of Draftsman's Patent I	
<ul> <li>Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-14</li> <li>Information on How to Effect Drawing C</li> </ul>		tice of Informal Patent Appli	cation, PTO-152.
-	manges, F10-14/4. <b>6.</b> []		
art II SUMMARY OF ACTION			
. X Ctairns / -	40	are	pending in the applica
Of the above, claims		are without	
2. Claims		hav	e been cancelled.
Claims / -		are	
ZClaims 32	,	are	
Z. Cialms			objected to.
			•
3. U Claims			•
7. $\square$ This application has been filed with informa	d drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are	acceptable for examination	n purposes.
<ol> <li>This application has been filed with informa</li> <li>Formal drawings are required in response to</li> </ol>		acceptable for examination	n purposes.
. Formal drawings are required in response t	to this Office action.		
_	to this Office action.	. Under 37 C.F.R.	1.84 these drawings
Discreptible in the corrected or substitute drawings have lare are acceptable; and acceptable (see	to this Office action.  been received on  explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Pate  t(s) of drawings, filed on	. Under 37 C.F.R. nt Drawing Review, PTO-94	1.84 these drawings 8).
3. Formal drawings are required in response to provide the corrected or substitute drawings have are acceptable; and acceptable (see co.). The proposed additional or substitute shee	to this Office action.  been received on explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Pate t(s) of drawings, filed on r (see explanation).	. Under 37 C.F.R. nt Drawing Review, PTO-94 has (have) been	1.84 these drawings 8). proved by the
3. Formal drawings are required in response to the corrected or substitute drawings have are acceptable; not acceptable (see to acceptable).  The proposed additional or substitute shee examiner; disapproved by the examine.	to this Office action.  been received on explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Pate t(s) of drawings, filed on r (see explanation).  has been appropriority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certifies	. Under 37 C.F.R. nt Drawing Review, PTO-94 has (have) been	1.84 these drawings .8). proved by the explanation).
B. Formal drawings are required in response to the corrected or substitute drawings have are acceptable; not acceptable (see acceptable).  The proposed additional or substitute shee examiner; disapproved by the examine.  The proposed drawing correction, filed	to this Office action.  been received on	. Under 37 C.F.R. nt Drawing Review, PTO-94 has (have) been	1.84 these drawings 8).  proved by the explanation).  d  not been received.
B. Formal drawings are required in response to the corrected or substitute drawings have are acceptable; and acceptable (see acceptable). The proposed additional or substitute shee examiner; disapproved by the examiner.  The proposed drawing correction, filed  Acknowledgement is made of the claim for a been filed in parent application, serial not serial substitute.	to this Office action.  been received on	. Under 37 C.F.R. nt Drawing Review, PTO-94 has (have) been	1.84 these drawings 8).  proved by the explanation).  d  not been received.

Serial Number: 08/467700 -2-

Art Unit: 3102

## Double Patenting

- 1. 35 U.S.C. § 101 reads as follows:
  - "Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefore, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title".
- 2. Claims 32-38 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 32-38 of copending application Serial No. 08/479335. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims do not substantially differ and it would have ben obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that Applicant is claiming the same invention in both applications.

This is a *provisional* obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

3. The obviousness-type double patenting rejection is a judicially established doctrine based upon public policy and is primarily intended to prevent prolongation of the patent term by prohibiting claims in a second patent not patentably distinct from claims in a first patent. *In re Vogel*, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970). A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.321(b) would overcome an actual or provisional rejection on this ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.78(d).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Serial Number: 08/467700

Art Unit: 3102

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

5. Claims 32, 33, 35, 37, 39, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Beam.

The rivet-like deformed section 50 is a temporary securing means and positions the cover centrally with respect to the wheel causing it to be spaced from the wheel outboard surface; and with respect to claim 37, the means 50 is considered to be resilient.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

7. Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Beam.

Serial Number: 08/467700

Art Unit: 3102

Beam meets all of the limitations of claim 32 as set forth in paragraph 5 above, but

-4-

does not disclose the use of a hot-melt adhesive. However, to substitute a hot-melt adhesive

for the epoxy used by Beam would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as a

suitable functional equivalent to the epoxy.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 1-31 are allowable over the prior art of record.

9. Claim 38 would be allowable upon the removal of the double patenting rejection.

10. Claim 36 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be

allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim

and any intervening claims, and the removal of the double patenting rejection.

Response to Amendment

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 39, and 40 are have

been considered but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

Serial Number: 08/467700 -5-

Art Unit: 3102

Lewis discloses a wheel cover having a temporary and a permanent securing means, but no adhesive. Carter, III discloses a wheel cover having a temporary fastener 40, 42, and a permanent fastener 34, but the cover is not secured directly to the wheel outboard surface by the permanent adhesive means.

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See M.P.E.P. § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

Art Unit: 3102

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Russell Stormer whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

rds April 1, 1996 RUSSELL D. STORMER PRIMARY EXAMINER

ART UNIT 312